



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,678	03/18/2004	Pekka Ketola	915-005.099	8566
4955	7590	10/15/2007	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP			ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D	
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224			2173	
MONROE, CT 06468			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/805,678	KETOLA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephen Alvesteffer	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed July 10, 2007. Claims 1, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23-25, 27, 28, and 30 are amended. Claims 31-33 are new. Claims 1, 15, and 30 are independent claims. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 6 recites, "*The method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the following operations: handling, receiving, sending, downloading, creating, deleting, is traced.*" There is no mention of a "handling" operation in the specification. Paragraph [0040] of the instant application specification states only, "*In summary, operations that relate to receiving, sending, downloading, creating or deleting can at least be recorded*".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 21-25, 27-30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraft, United States Patent number 6,309,305.

Regarding claim 1, Kraft teaches a method for transferring data from a source application to a target application (see column 1 lines 46-55; *"there is provided a method of transferring data from one application to another"*), the method comprising: tracing an operation relating to the source application (see column 4 lines 56-65; *"the user moves the cursor 24 to a message, and presses the soft key 8 having the functionality "Copy"*", the "Copy" operation is traced), extracting at least one item from said operation (see column 1 line 56 through column 2 line 4; *"the complex data structure is analyzed, and predetermined types of subitems in the complex data structure are identified"*, the identified subitems are extracted from the said operation), recording said item into a file (see column 1 lines 56-67; *"The transfer is handled by copying data to clipboard storage means as a complex data structure"*, the clipboard storage means is equivalent to the file), calling said file by the target application for selecting and pasting the item to said target application (see column 1 lines 46-55; *"displaying said types of subitems for selection by the user upon reception of a pasting request for the data on the clipboard into said another application"*).

Regarding claim 2, Kraft teaches that the item is selected from the file by means of a clipboard (see column 2 lines 19-33; *"a working storage that holds data and programs used in said applications and storage means acting as a clipboard when copying and pasting data from one application to another"*).

Regarding claim 5, Kraft teaches that the file is a log file (see column 2 lines 19-33; *"a working storage that holds data and programs used in said applications and storage means acting as a clipboard when copying and pasting data from one application to another"*, the storage means acting as a clipboard is equivalent to a log file).

Regarding claim 8, Kraft teaches that the source application and the target application are located within one application program (see Kraft column 1 lines 13-19; *"the copy and paste function can be used to copy text strings from one application to another or from one document in one application to another document in the same application or from one location in a document to another location in the same document"*).

Regarding claim 9, Kraft teaches that the source application and the target application are located in different application programs (see column 1 lines 46-55; *"displaying said types of subitems for selection by the user upon reception of a pasting request for the data on the clipboard into said another application"*).

Regarding claim 11, Kraft teaches that said file is shared between application programs of a computing device (see column 2 lines 19-33; *"storage means acting as a clipboard when copying and pasting data from one application to another"*, the file acting as the clipboard must inherently be shared between the source and destination applications).

Regarding claim 12, Kraft teaches that a type of the item is identified (see column 1 lines 46-55; *"identifying predetermined types of subitems in the contents of the data copied to the clipboard"*).

Regarding claim 13, Kraft teaches that said type belongs to one of the following groups: image, audio, video, text, URL, phonebook entry, music, calendar event, wallet and error message (see column 1 lines 56-67; *"These subitems may be ordinary words, phone numbers or dates"*).

Regarding claim 14, Kraft teaches that said type is used for classifying the item (see column 7 lines 9-16; *"classification is continued until it has been detected in step 57 that all the words stored in the RAM 15 during the analyzing have been classified. The words for classification are entered successively in step 58. Words including a string of continuous digits are classified as possible phone numbers in step 59"*).

Claims 15, 16, 18, and 21-25 recite a device with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12, and 14, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 27, Kraft teaches that the device is further configured for manual copying (see column 6 lines 31-42; *"The user moves the cursor 24 via the calendar menu 39 to the desired date in the calendar list 40 and selects "Copy"*).

Regarding claim 28, Kraft teaches that the device is further configured for mobile communication (see Kraft claim 1; *"A method of transferring data from one application to another in an application handling unit of a mobile telephone controlling a plurality of applications"*).

Claim 29 recites a system for implementing the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 30 recites a computer program product with substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 33, Kraft teaches calling said file by the target application; selecting and pasting the item to said target application (see paragraph 1 lines 56-67; *"When the user requests the pasting of an item in the complex data structure into another application, a list of subitems will be displayed and the user may select the item which he finds appropriate to paste"*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 17, 19, 20, 26, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (6,309,305) *supra* and Multiple Item On-line Clipboard, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, July 1992, Volume 35, issue 2, page 425, NN9207425 (hereinafter IBM).

Regarding claim 3, Kraft teaches every limitation of claim 3, but does not explicitly teach that more than one operations are traced and recorded. However, IBM

teaches tracing and recording more than one operation to save a command history to a clipboard (see IBM; *"Provided is a method for clipping a command history from one computer session into one or more other computer sessions"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to record a command history as taught by IBM and provide data from the recorded commands for pasting as taught by Kraft, for the purpose of gaining efficiency by eliminating the need to manually select data to copy.

Regarding claim 4, IBM teaches that said operation is traced automatically (see IBM; *"automatically assigning the history of commands from one session to one or more other sessions so that the particular history may be recalled within a session which may not have created said history"*).

Regarding claim 6, IBM teaches that at least one of the following operations: handling, receiving, sending, downloading, creating, deleting, is traced (see IBM; *"The user is able to select an arbitrary session, capture the history of commands from that session, and select one or more target sessions for which the history of commands can be moved to"*, the history of commands taught by IBM includes any command such as receiving, sending, downloading, creating, or deleting).

Regarding claim 7, Kraft teaches that said item is a content of the operation or a property of the operation (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; *"identifying predetermined types of subitems in the contents of the data copied to the clipboard"*, once an operation is identified for pasting, Kraft teaches allowing a user to identify content from the operation for pasting).

Claims 17, 19, and 20 recite a device with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 4, 6, and 7, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 26, Kraft teaches that said operation is implemented without user action (see IBM; *"automatically assigning the history of commands from one session to one or more other sessions so that the particular history may be recalled within a session which may not have created said history"*).

Regarding claim 31, Kraft teaches tracing the latest operation relating to the source application right after said operation has occurred (see IBM; *"A history of commands may be entered within the session"*, every operation is recorded into the Command History).

Regarding claim 32, Kraft teaches tracing the latest operation automatically (see IBM; *"A history of commands may be entered within the session"*, the operations are automatically recorded in the Command History).

Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (6,309,305) *supra* and Beged-Dov et al. (hereinafter Beged-Dov), United States Patent number 6,983,328.

Regarding claim 10, Kraft teaches every limitation of claim 10 except that the source application and the target application are located in different devices. However, Beged-Dov teaches a Trusted Internet Clipboard web service for copying from a source web application to a target web application (see Beged-Dov column 2 lines 11-26;

"using an intermediary Trusted Internet Clipboard web service to loosely couple source and destination web services for the purpose of efficiently and securely transferring resource(s) from the source web service to the destination web service without requiring the resource(s) to be intermediately transferred to and from an end-user's client computer", web services are capable of residing on different server devices). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the copying and pasting between different web service applications as taught by Beged-Dov with the copy and paste user interface taught by Kraft in order to allow copy and paste operations between remote applications.

Response to Arguments

The amendments to the specification have been accepted by the examiner. Accordingly, the objections to the specification that were presented in the prior Office Action have been withdrawn.

The amendments to the claims correct the informalities objected to in the prior Office Action. Accordingly, the objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner is unable to find an adequate definition of "tracing" operations in the original disclosure. Therefore, the meaning of "tracing" is interpreted as is ordinarily known in the art. By recording a "copy" operation and subsequently analyzing the copied data, Kraft is believed to be "tracing" the operation. IBM is also believed to be "tracing" operations when it records user-issued commands to the Command History.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2173



10-11-2007

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
